Gallaudet College

Kendall Green Washington 2, D. C.

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT



April 24, 1959

The Hon. John E. Fogarty House of Representatives Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Fogarty:

I have your letter and also a copy of the letter you have received from Dr. Wilkerson. I am glad he wrote you as he did. I think we understand each other.

My statement did not intend to indicate that these large centers are not interested. I used the word "more." There are training centers for teachers of the deaf, such as Gallaudet, which concentrate on training for teaching the deaf, and have done so for a period of 60 years. Trainees from these centers are in great demand because they have concentrated on the deaf child. There are 25,525 pupils registered in schools for the deaf at this time (this figure is from the 1959 statistical issue of the American Annals of the Deaf, with editorial offices at Gallaudet College). These children require especially trained teachers. There are millions of children with minor hearing losses whose problems are as severe in their way as those of the severely deafened child, and naturally a larger number of teachers are needed for the larger group. However, a well trained teacher of a hard-of-hearing child is not necessarily a well trained teacher of the deaf child. It is in the interest of the latter group that I register my concern. All I hope for is that the training centers that have carried the load down through the years will not be left out when a bill is written because they don't have all of the requisites that may be included in the wording of the bill. I like the bill. I think it is generally inclusive. I can see where a few changes will make it all inclusive and more effective. We need this bill because we need teachers. Too many schools for the deaf are forced to take untrained teachers and offer "in service" training, which is not satisfactory. I am certain all training centers will go all the way in their support of a strong bill.

I am inclosing a copy of this letter so that you may send one on to Dr. Wilkerson, if you like. If satisfactory to you, we should like to make the insertions or changes which we think would improve the bill.

As I understand it, there is another resolution being considered at this time. I don't know there is any value in having two bills for the same purpose. There are those who think there is some value in specifically designating certain types of teachers for special aid and then another bill for those who enter into a wider field of service for those with hearing losses. We should be very thankful to get one bill through which would cover all the requirements.

Again, thank you for your continued interest in our profession. We will be glad to cooperate in any way we can.

Sincerely yours,

Leonard M. Elstad and

President